*University of Alberta Students' Union*

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL LATE ADDITIONS

## Tuesday, April 1, 2003 – 6:00 PM
## Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

2002-23/8 **MINUTES**

Minutes from the March 11, 2003 and March 18, 2003 meeting.

2002-23/12 **LEGISLATION**

2002-23/12n LO/JONES MOVED THAT Bylaw 2100 be amended so as to restore campaign spending limits to those recommended by FARCE; and restore flexibility with respect to electoral dates, and further that this bylaw be remanded to IRB for action consistent with this motion.

2002-23/12o REID MOVED THAT Students' Council adopt the proposed political policy relating to SARS.

Please see document LA 02-23.01.

2002-23/14 **REPORTS**

2002-23/14a External Affairs Board Minutes

Please see document LA 02-23.02.

2002-23/15 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2002-23/15a Operating Policy – SUB Stage

Please see document LA 02-23.03.

*University of Alberta Students' Union*

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

## Tuesday March 11, 2003 – 6:00 PM
## Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

**MINUTES (SC 2002-21)**

| Faculty/Position | Name | 6:00 | 9:00 | Roll Call Vote #1 Iraq | Roll Call Vote #2 Campaign Budget | Roll Call Vote #3 2100 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| President | Mike Hudema | ✓ | ✓ | For | For | For |
| VP Academic | Mat Brechtel | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | For |
| VP External | Anand Sharma | ✓ | ✓ | For | Against | Against |
| VP Finance | Steve Smith | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | For |
| VP Student Life | Kail Ross | ✓ | ✓ | Against | For | For |
| BoG Rep | Mike Reid | ✓ (6:15) | ✓ | | For | |
| RHA | George Slomp | ✓ | ✓ | For | For | For |
| Athletics Board | | | | | | |
| Ag/For/HomeEc | Teodora Alampi | ✓ | ✓ | For | For | For |
| Ag/For/HomeEc | Paul Reikie | ✓ | ✓ | For | For | For |
| Arts | Chris Bolivar (Chelli Kelly) | ✓ | ✓ | | Against | Against |

| Arts | Kyle Kawanami | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | Against |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arts | James Knull | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | For |
| Arts | Matt Oberhoffner | ✓ | ✓ | Against | For | For |
| Arts | Alexis Pepin (Ed Aronyk) | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | Abstain |
| **Faculty/Position** | **Name** | **6:00** | **9:00** | **Roll Call Vote #1 Iraq** | **Roll Call Vote #2 Campaign Budget** | **Roll Call Vote #3 2100** |
| Arts | Vivek Sharma | ✓ | ✓ | For | For | For |
| Arts | Paul Welke | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | For |
| Business | Jamie Kidston | ✓ (6:30) | ✓ | Against | For | For |
| Business | Meena Rajulu | ✓ | ✓ | For | For | For |
| Business | Holly Tomte | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | For |
| Education | Charles Beamish | ✓ | ✓ | For | Against | Against |
| Education | Daljeet Chhina | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | |
| Education | Allison Ekdahl | ✓ | ✓ | | For | For |
| Education | Mandeep Gill | ✓ | ✓ | | For | For |
| Education | Janet Lo | ✓ | ✓ | For | For | For |
| Engineering | Chris Jones | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | Against |
| Engineering | Margaret Laffin | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | Against |
| Engineering | Paige Smith | ✓ | ✓ | Against | For | |
| Engineering | Michelle Vigeant | ✓ | ✓ | Against | For | |
| Engineering | David Weppler | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | Abstain |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Law | Paul Varga | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | Against |
| Med/Dent | Miranda Richardson (Patricia Tsang) | ✓ | ✓ | For | For | |
| Med/Dent | Jeffrey Cao | ✓ | ✓ | For | For | |
| Native Studies | Valerie Knaga | × | × | | | |
| Nursing | | | | | | |
| Open Studies | | | | | | |
| Open Studies | | | | | | |
| Pharmacy | Kurt Greene | ✓ | ✓ | Against | For | |
| Phys Ed | Holly Higgins | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | For |
| **Faculty/Position** | **Name** | **6:00** | **9:00** | **Roll Call Vote #1 Iraq** | **Roll Call Vote #2 Campaign Budget** | **Roll Call Vote #3 2100** |
| Faculté St-Jean | Lisa Clyburn | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | Against |
| Science | Chamila Adhihetty | ✓ | ✓ | Against | For | |
| Science | Kimberly Dary (Duncan Taylor) | ✓ | ✓ | For | Against | |
| Science | Katie Grant | ✓ | ✓ | Against | For | For |
| Science | Aisha Khatib | ✓ | ✓ | For | For | |
| Science | Tereza Elyas | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | For |
| Science | Chris Samuel | ✓ | ✓ | Against | For | For |
| Science | Steven Schendel | ✓ | ✓ | Against | Against | Against |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science | Kimmy Williams | ✓ | ✓ | Abstain | Abstain | Against |
| Gen Mngr | Bill Smith | × | × | | | |
| Speaker | Gregory Harlow | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Rec Sec | Helen McGraw | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| | | | | Carried (15/25/1) | Carried (24/20/1) | Carried (22/10/2) |

Observers: James Meeker, Nick Tam, Roman Kotovych, Shawna Pandya, Keith

## MINUTES (SC 2002-21)

2002-21/1 CALL TO ORDER (6:10)

2002-21/4 SPEAKER'S BUSINESS

Congratulations to the victors and all candidates of the thankfully finished elections. Proof of student status is still required from **Hudema**, **Smith**, **Brechtel**, and **Sharma**. **Ross** is evidently the most diligent and studious member of the executive.

Beamish will be having his 23rd birthday tomorrow – come party at RATT!

2002-21/6 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

SMITH MOVED TO APPROVE the Agenda for the March 11 meeting.

WILLIAMS/HUDEMA MOVED TO ADD item 13g reading "Resolved that Students' Council nominate one councilor to serve on the Community Relations Coordinator Nomination Committee"

**Carried**

WELKE/OBERHOFFNER MOVED TO ADD Late Additions 13d-f

**Carried**

WEPPLER MOVED TO ADD a 10 minute presentation on "International Pie Throwing"
**Weppler:** It is imperative that this presentation be given tonight as the whipped cream involved will go bad if it waits for a week.
**Carried**

REIKIE/HUDEMA MOVED TO ADD 13a reading "Resolved that Students' Council mandate the President to write a letter to the University, Member of Parliament, Prime Minister and the Minister of Defense declaring the opinion of the university students regarding the proposed US-led war on Iraq" and renumber accordingly.
**Carried**

SHARMA/BEAMISH MOVED TO ADD 13i: Vice-President (External) boards and committees.
**Carried**

JONES/WELKE MOVED TO make 7a, 12f, and 13a (Pie Throwing and Iraq) Special Orders
**Carried**

Procedural errors corrected in a friendly manner:
-12e is in 2nd reading
-12f should have been included on the original agenda

**Carried**

**2002-21/13e**
**Motion to Censure (Matter of Precedence)**

JONES/OBERHOFFNER MOVED THAT Students' Council censure and reprimand the President and Vice-President (External) with respect to their conduct during the SU General Election, including (but not limited to) the misuse of Students' Union resources (viz. space and staff time) in such a way as to cast doubt upon the integrity and the perceived integrity of the electoral process.

**Jones:** On the Thursday of elections, list of the SU's accomplishments was posted on the website and former wall of debt. The selection of items on this list was clearly biased against two individuals contesting the election. This represents a misuse of SU resources, was an attempt to bias the election and is therefore against SU bylaws and policy.

**Hudema:** The impetus for posting the list was provided by

the forums where audience members felt that they didn't know what the SU had done for them. We complied a list to inform students of the SU's accomplishments. In our last exec meeting we had a discussion about how it was posted (it was taken down on Thursday night after councilor and student complaints). It definitely wasn't done to bias the election in any way. **Ross** spoke against putting up the list; **Sharma** and several staff members approved of the idea. I voted for one of the candidates that you claim I'm biased against so that contention is obviously ill-founded.

**Beamish (POI):** Was the add-drop deadline on the list?

**Hudema**: Yes, both the add-drop deadline and the handbook were on the list

**Weppler**: One of the Go Vote posters encouraged students to vote because they wanted to see more protests.

**Hudema (POI):** Did you know that not only did I speak out against the posters because I thought they perpetuated stereotypes, but also that no member of the executive endorsed the posters?

**Weppler**: Thanks for preemptively answering my question!

**Ross**: Very few students would have drawn a connection between that list and **Hudema's** sinister and underhanded plan to manipulate the election. Defeat this.

**Beamish**: Please provide a concrete example of how this list favored one candidate over another;

**Sharma**: Every year, execs brag to students about their accomplishments. I expected that all VPs would add their achievements to the list (I myself added 6 or 7 that were missed in the original draft). I don't think this list changed anyone's voting plans.

**Lo (POI):** Was every exec member consulted?

**Sharma**: No, because two were on a leave of absence as they were running in the election.

**Kawanami**: This strikes to the heart of the process as well as students' perception of the process. It was not the best decision to have individual executives' names attached to different accomplishments when two execs were in the election, especially since some execs had longer lists by their names and there were numerous omissions from the list. The add-drop deadline was on the wall of debt but not the

website. There's no reason why this couldn't have waited until after the election.

**Smith:** This was a bad idea in the first place and it turned into a fiasco when an incomplete list was posted. That said, the exec can't grind to a halt during elections. This isn't the worst thing two members of the exec have done in recent years, nor the worst thing any of us have done this year, nor even the worst thing that these two individual exec members have done this year. This censure is wildly disproportionate.

**Sharma (Councilor):** Students' perception of the SU is that we don't do anything. During elections, it is key that the accomplishments of the SU be publicized. The accomplishments of Smith and Brechtel were already extensively promoted in the Gateway and at forums. This list likely did nothing to change people's voting plans.

Reid: Sec 43 of Bylaw 2100 states that no member of the exec committee shall campaign for or endorse a candidate or provide the resources of the SU for a campaign. The exec is expected to maintain a degree of impartiality unless they are willing to take a leave of absence.

WILLIAMS/SCHENDEL MOVED the previous question.

**Carried**

**Defeated (14/26/6)** Abstaining: **Hudema, Sharma**

2002-21/7 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

2002-21/7a "International Pie-Throwing" (Special Order #1)

**David Weppler: International Pie-Throwing**

Each year, Engineers Without Borders holds a pie-throwing event to raise money for charity (this year they raised >$1000 for Habitat for Humanity). For $10, you can arrange for a person to be pied. The pies are administered by volunteers who present the recipient with 4 options: take the pie in the face for free, buy the pie for $\pi^3$ dollars ($31.01), redirect the pie for $10, or choose not to participate. Several pies still require delivery and are to be administered at tonight's meeting; the festivities will be videotaped.

Proper pie throwing requires a great deal of finesse and there are a number of important guidelines on its technique. The pies themselves consist of whipped cream applied liberally to paper plates; garbage bags are used as protection against dirtiness and damage deposit forfeiture. The pie must be driven up the recipient's face, the goal being for it to enter the nostrils. The pie is pushed up, over one ear to the back of the head, then back up against the grain of the hair for optimal whipped cream coverage.

The first pie is for me (redirected from the Dean of Engineering) and I would like **Hudema** to be my celebrity pie-thrower. [**Weppler** took his pie with admirable grace and composure].

**Hudema:** Can I take this as approval for my pieing people generally?

**Weppler:** Only if it's for charity.

The remaining 4 pies are for **Sharma:** 3 are from **Reid**, 1 from **Kawanami.** Out of his inspiring benevolence and love for charity, **Reid** paid extra for his pies, so they would cost $30 each to defer. [Lacking the requisite $100, Sharma agreed to be a good sport and take the pies, which consisted of 4 times the whipped cream applied to a single paper plate. **Kawanami** delivered the pie, demonstrating exceptional technique].

**Sharma:** [to thunderous applause] "I'm not wiping it, I'm eating it!"

Thank you for your patience and enthusiasm; watch for this same event around election time next year!

**2002-21/12f**

**Political Policy**

**"War as a Means of Conflict Resolution"**

**(Special Order #2)**

REIKIE/SLOMP MOVED THAT Students' Council adopt the proposed political policy "War as a Means of Conflict Resolution".

*Please see document LA 02-21.01*

JONES MOVED TO REJECT consideration of the question.

**Defeated (13/20/3)**

REIKIE/SHARMA MOVED TO LIMIT debate to 10 min.

Carried

**Reikie**: The SU is mandated to promote the general welfare of students. There are a lot of students who would be emotionally affected by this war: U of A students may lose family or friends and students opposed to the war will suffer from emotional trauma. The opinions of students as expressed in the Gateway and at recent rallies speak to their objections. The SU can exercise its political energies without considerable cost. CFS and other universities have political policies against war. This isn't a question of right versus left; it's within our power and important for the psychological welfare of students.

**Slomp**: There are fears that this policy will alienate students but those fears are misconceived. Rather, this will show that the SU is willing to stand up for its members who are deeply concerned on an issue. Anti-war rallies have been poorly received in other venues so it is important that they be accepted here. This sends a strong message to how important we are and the role we play in society.

**Clyburn (POI):** Do you not acknowledge that many students also support a war on Iraq; aren't we failing to represent those students?

**Slomp**: Taking a stance doesn't preclude listening to alternate views. Students who oppose the war don't have support from anywhere else; those who are in favor if it have the support of Bush

**Jones**: I support the war as a means of Keynesian economy building; Bush neither supports nor represents me.

HUDEMA/SHARMA MOVED TO EXTEND the discussion for an additional 10 minutes.

Carried

**Welke**: As a current member of the Canadian Forces, I'm probably the councilor most affected by this possible war. I don't think the U of A SU has all of the information necessary

to make a sound decision on this question (even me, with my Level 3 Security clearance). This policy needs to be reexamined. For example, the fist resolution isn't specific enough: it stands in opposition of all wars, even just ones.

**Smith (Councilor):** There are plenty of larger, more important issues facing students; why are we focusing our energies on this? We can't hope to represent all students on campus with such a narrow policy. My constituents all opposed this motion. Even if we did take a stance, nobody would care.

BEAMISH MOVED TO STRIKE the first resolution ("BIRT the U of A SU oppose the use of war as a means of conflict resolution") and add "without UN approval" to the end of the second resolution.

**Hudema**: Someone will be opposed to every political policy we pass; we've passed policies on differential tuition despite the fact that some students support it. I speak highly in favor of this amendment: while we may lack sufficient information, the United Nations is much better positioned to make a decision on this matter. The anti-war movement is clearly changing the course of history and has thus far prevented the US from embarking on a war without UN approval. Other student associations have passed similar policies and the Edmonton city council will soon be considering one.

**Carried (33/9/0)**

**Defeated (15/25/1) (Roll Call)**

**2002-21/13a "Letter of Opposition" (Special Order #3)**

REIKIE/HUDEMA MOVED THAT Students' Council mandate the President to write a letter to the University, Member of Parliament, Prime Minister and the Minister of Defense declaring the opinion of the university students regarding the proposed US-led war on Iraq.

**Reikie**: As educated, informed citizens we are the intellectual cream of the crop. Politicians are soliciting the views of their constituents and we have an obligation to make student voices heard.

**Schendel**: I encourage **Reikie** to write a letter on the behalf of his constituents but Council has already dealt with this issue once tonight.

**Kawanami:** Since we just voted against a political policy on Iraq, what would be the content of this letter? Further, it is rather patronizing of us to write letters on behalf of students who are themselves constituents of the people to whom we are writing. When we write letters to the Ministry of Learning, we write on behalf of our constituents as students; this is entirely external to our jurisdiction. Letter-writing campaigns such as this are the reason why this organization pulled out of CFS. Those students who support Iraq will feel further antagonized when the President and VP External write letters after council rejected a political policy. I encourage individual councilors to write their own letters if they believe that best represents their constituents.
**Ross:** Since we just defeated a political policy, the President clearly doesn't have the support of students on this issue. Let's not send letters on issues on which we lack a clear student consensus.
**Weppler:** How about we deal with student issues on which we can make a difference, rather than wasting Council's time on irrelevant issues? This issue that is outside our realm of relevance and influence; why has this crap been brought before us when we could be debating issues on which we could make a real difference?
**Sharma**; If we're serious about coalition building, this is the minimum that we can do. I think students are strongly in favor of a motion such as this and against the war on Iraq. This is not a CFS issue. Many schools outside of CFS have taken similar stances, some broader than others.
**Beamish:** The vast majority of my constituents support action by the SU. Even if the UN doesn't care, my constituents do. Governments that don't represent their constituents will ultimately fail. Maybe the reason our voter turnout is so low is because we don't deal with issues that are of utmost importance to students.

BEAMISH MOVED THAT the letter be approved by the executive committee before being sent.
**Friendly**

**Williams:** I'm against war but my constituents are opposed to this question. We need to pick our battles and this isn't a good one.
**Taylor:** A letter from one person in a position of power will be stronger than 50 letters from unknown people. If we want the government to listen to us on tuition, we need to

show that the SU is a mature body that will take action on issues of importance, not just selfish ones.
**Khatib:** While this might not be the best battle, when we are at war, are we just going to sit back? How we deal with the repercussions?
**Oberhoffner:** I would like to remind council that it is 8:00 and we have not yet approved the minutes of the previous meeting. Unless you have something new and relevant to say, please don't say anything.

KIDSTON/WELKE Called the previous question
**Carried**

**Defeated (15/26/1)**

2002-21/8 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

SCHENDEL/SAMUEL MOVED TO approve the minutes of the Feb 4 meeting
-p. 3: Schendel was present at 6:00 and at 9:00
-p. 6: "SU elections system" should read "SU legal system"
-p. 7: "benefit to the fee structure" should read "benefit to the fairness of the fee structure"
-p. 9: "dispersed" should read "disbursed"
**Carried**

2002-21/9 QUESTION PERIOD

**Kawanami:** Will students who volunteer for the letter-writing roster be able to alter the letters as they see fit?
**Hudema:** The idea (from ATA President Larry Booi) is to get people to write letters to the editor when education-related issues appear in the media.

**Beamish:** Native Studies wasn't listed as a faculty option on the elections ballot. Why isn't the promised apology in today's Gateway?
**Smith:** The apology was submitted and should be printed next week.

**Laffin:** Why were off-campus students unable to vote online in the APIRG election?
**Smith:** APIRG paid us to use some of the SU's polling stations; they had their own ballots and ballot boxes and had nothing to do with online voting.

Cao: When will the UPass be implemented?
Hudema: It will have to be approved in a referendum before implementation. ETS's latest offer is $213, which we think is too high. We've approached the university to see if they would subsidize us (there is a possibility that faculty and staff could opt in without the price changing). Our target price is around $150. We will be making presentations to the City of Edmonton, St. Albert and Strathcona county to seek subsidies from those bodies.
Samuel: Will an opt-out mechanism be ensured?
Hudema: Anyone who can prove that they don't have access to transit can opt out, but an opt out won't be available to students who live near campus. My personal belief is that the pass should cost, say, $151 to fund a subsidy pool, but this idea isn't supported by the rest of the executive.

Williams: Why are the sports teams talking about boycotting RATT?
Ross: In the past, when our sporting gods came to RATT they received $6 pitchers for $5. It is disgusting to ask normal students to subsidize the sporting elite and the policy was ended this year, much to their objection.

2002-21/10 APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (MINUTES)

*Please see document SC 02-21.01.*

2002-21/12 LEGISLATION

2002-21/12a Bylaw 2100 SMITH/SLOMP MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the proposed amendments to Bylaw 2100 (SECOND Reading).

*Please see document SC 02-21.02.*

JONES/WELKE MOVED TO AMEND section 38 to read "Any member with the exception of the CRO, the DROs, and candidates be free to act as a volunteer for or endorse multiple candidates."

Hudema: There would be a tremendous advantage in the election for candidates to be able to endorse each other; it would be like running a slate without running a slate.

**Smith (POI):** Is the president of the opinion that this practice has occurred under our current bylaw structure?
**Hudema:** No. I think candidates should stand on their own platforms and beliefs.
**Samuel:** It is possible that a candidate could recruit people to run for the sole purpose receiving their endorsement. This has implications for campaign budgets. Candidates should not be able to endorse each other without actually declaring a slate.
**Smith:** Unofficial slates already exist; we should bring them out in the open.

Carried (19/15/3)

BRECHTEL/LO MOVED TO add "and incumbent members of the executive committee" to section 38.
**Brechtel:** Members of the executive committee have an unfair advantage through their knowledge and their actions have the power to affect the outcome of the election.
**Smith (POI):** What stops a member of the exec from doing these same damaging things while on a leave of absence?
**Brechtel:** Having to take a leave of absence is a disincentive. An exec member should not be able to pick his successor.
**Samuel:** While I understand the principle behind this amendment, it doesn't make sense. Even on a leave of absence, you're still a member of the exec, you're just not getting paid and you're not carrying out your duties.
**Smith:** The onus is on the people restricting freedoms to provide a rationale for the restriction. **Brechtel** has done so and I'll explain why it's bogus. He said it's unfair for a member of the exec to make his opponents look like swiss cheese. But it's been made abundantly clear that these individuals can do so on a leave of absence. For this amendment to accomplish anything it would have to restrict execs on leaves of absence too.
**Jones:** We all agree that exec members should use their powers for good not evil. Section 36 restricts the use of volunteer labor and expertise that is not available for all candidates, which is exactly exec information and endorsement would be. The CRO already has the authority to prevent this and no special provisions are needed.
**Welke:** We shouldn't be supporting exec members with a salary if they're trying to monkey around with the elections.

Carried (26/12/3)

KAWANAMI/JONES MOVED TO AMEND article 4 (dates of election) to read "The elections shall be held annually on two consecutive weekdays between the third Wednesday of January and the third Thursday of March, to be determined and announced by the CRO prior to the end of November each year."

Kawanami: In addition to maintaining the recommendations of the committee, this allows flexibility. For many years, tuition decisions have come down during the election campaign. This also allows centralized councilor elections to occur at a better time. If you have a problem with this, it probably should have been raised when the FARCE recommendations were originally approved.
Weppler: Reading Week provides an excellent time for candidates to focus on their campaigns without unduly affecting their academic careers. March is a good time for elections as it is near the end of terms and will thus have minimal impact on projects underway. This is a change for the sake of change and no particular impetus has been identified.
Jones: I had midterms throughout campaign week. Indeed one of Weppler's arguments for moving Engineering Week to January was that it is a better time for preparations and distractions. January elections would provide even more flexibility, allowing candidates to prepare over Christmas break. We don't lose anything by allowing the CRO to choose from a more flexible range; this is a superset of the existing options.
Brechtel: Candidates are already asked to sacrifice a lot of time to prepare and for transition; 4 months of transition is unreasonable.
Defeated (20/25/0)

LO/KIDSTON MOVED TO AMEND article 52 to read "no candidate shall have more than 10 posters on display in any given building at any given time"
Lo: This is in response to poster pollution concerns of students, particularly in Tory, Business and CIVE. We need to be concerned with how much paper we use and this can be controlled by restrictions on money and on the number of posters permitted per building.
Kidston: Students don't need to see the same poster every few feet. Even in a big building, 10 posters should be

sufficient.
**Smith**: The last few years have seen an excess of 20 candidates and thus a glut of posters. Keep in mind that two years ago there were only 12 candidates. Poster pollution increases voter turnout. I will be voting no but I give everyone permission to vote yes if they want.
**Samuel**: If you take away the emphasis on posters, more people will look for other sources of information (i.e. platforms) and this is ultimately to the benefit of the electoral process
**Oberhoffner**: This year had one of the lowest voter turnouts, clearly defeating Smith's point that poster pollution encourages turnout.
**Alampi**: Some students decided not to vote in response to the overload of posters. Clutter confuses people. Fewer posters will save paper and money.
**Welke**: I'm a total dick and don't really care about saving paper but I'm still in favor of this motion because it will greatly decrease the probability of me ever seeing Blair Dent naked again.
**Kawanami**: It is important that we avoid micromanaging campaigns in bylaw; we need to allow individual candidates to determine how to allocate their resources. This is overly intrusive.

ROSS/TAYLOR MOVED the previous question
Carried

Carried (29/12/0)

KIDSTON/HUDEMA MOVED TO AMEND section 61 to replace "$700" with "$350"

**Kidston**: Most people were appalled when they learned that candidates had $600 budgets; $350 is plenty to work with.
**Hudema**: Big glossy posters cost more than $350, but are they necessary to engage students in the SU elections process? Everything you need to do can be done on $350: 10 posters per building, handbills, bag tags. This is student money and if the trend for numerous candidates increases, more and more of the SU's budget will be spent on big glossy posters.
**Reid**: I'm going to agree with Hudema [shocked gasps]; this is a waste of money.
**Jones**: Print Center posters don't hold up against glossy

posters, but that becomes less of a problem if no one can afford glossy posters. The main area this hinders is getting Gateway ads (half page = $400). This starts to limit how people can campaign. I spent $70 on Duplo this year. I could have spent more and built a Lego castle. When you lower the amount, you start to limit people's ability to build Lego castles. 20 buildings x 10 SUPC posters @ $1.55 = $320 and you still have to buy tape.
**Slomp**: U of C elections candidates get about $300. There are no poster eyesores and no one seemed to have a problem with it. Money and creativity need be directly correlated.

SHARMA (COUNCILOR)/WILLIAMS MOVED the previous question
**Carried**

**Carried (24/20/1) (Roll Call)**

JONES/ROSS MOVED TO AMEND sections 62 and 63 to halve the funding available for slates: replace "$525" with "$262.50" and "$175" with "$87.50"

**Jones**: Since we have just halved the amount available to individual candidates, it is only appropriate that we do the same thing for slates.
**Welke**: Not to be a hippie, we need to think about critical mass: you can't run a campaign on less than $100.

WELKE/KELLY MOVED TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT by replacing "$87.50" with "$120."

**Smith**: Candidates will have more than $100 as they have access to slate funding as well. Given all of the consultation that went into the FARCE recommendations and the fact that council as a whole endorsed these recommendations, it is frustrating that amendments to amendments are being raised out of ignorance.
**Defeated**

**Sharma**: I understand the need for environmental sensitivity and financial prudence, but this is being taken to an extreme and will severely hurt the election process. It also gives an undue advantage to incumbents.
**Samuel**: While this amount may be too low for fancy campaigns and glossy posters, the question is whether these

things are important for the campaign. It is important that the resources available to slates be proportionate to those available to individual candidates. A smaller budget forces candidates to be creative and more selective in their campaign materials.
**Kawanami**: We already voted on the $350. In the interests of consistency we have no choice but to lower the amount for slates.
**Kelly**: $87.50 isn't enough to print up posters about yourself.
**Lo**: The dollar amount may not be enough to print glossy posters but it sets a precedent and requires candidates to prioritize their expenses.

HUDEMA/EKDAHL MOVED the previous question
**Carried**

**Carried (24/8/1)**

**Jones**: Since we're drastically undoing FARCE'S recommendations and returning them to the status quo, be aware that we are also drastically changing the method of voting to a preferential system, so now would be a good time to change that too.

**Carried (18/11/3)**
**Roll Call: Smith, Samuel, Slomp, Welke, Brechtel**
**Carried (22/10/2)**

BRECHTEL/EKDAHL MOVED TO make 13b-h Special Orders
**Carried**

2002-21/13 NEW BUSINESS

2002-21/13b (Special Order #4)

HUDEMA/BRECHTEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Awards Selection Committee, ratify the selection of the winners for the following awards:

Royal Bank Student Faculty Association Involvement Award (**Teodora Alampi**)
Hilda Wilson Memorial Volunteer Recognition Award (**Kathryn Andrusky, Nicole Avanthey**)
Royal Bank Financial Group Involvement Award (**Anne Aspler, Sarah Li**)
Cristal Mar Memorial Award (**Toluope Bakinson, Dallas**

Holyroyd)
Walter A. Dinwoodie Award (Charles Beamish, Amanda Hostland)
Alberta Treasury Branches Involvement Award (Jordan Blatz, Jenny Chen)
Java Jive Merchants Ltd. Award (Haley Cleary, Jenny Fricke, Rebecca Reeves)
Eugene L. Brody Award (Lisa Clyburn, Breanne McCook)
Anne Louise Mundell Humanitarian Award (Adam Houston, Heather Davidson)
Subway Sandwiches Award (Donal Finegan, Yan Ni Sui)
Tevie Miller Involvement Award (Michael Horler, Aida Sadr)
Tom Lancaster Award (Sara Katz, Christopher Samuel)
Lorne Calhoun Award (James Knull, Matt Oberhoffner)
Students' Union Award for Excellence (Queenie Lung)
Hooper-Munroe Academic Award (Amy Yarbrough)
Mamie Shaw Simpson Book Prize (Julia-Lin Miller, Athena Photinopoulos)
Dr. Randy Gregg Athletics Award (Jennifer Nguyen, Michelle Rau)
Dean Mortensen Award (Ross Semeniuk, Shea Severson)

Carried (Abstaining: Knull, Alampi, Jones, Beamish, Clyburn, Oberhoffner, Samuel)

2002-21/13c (Special Order #5)

HUDEMA/BRECHTEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Gold Key Awards Selection Committee, ratify the selection of the winners of the Gold Key Awards.

**Teodora Alampi, Melissa Creech, Keith Diakiw, Jason Ding, Rejean Gareau, Trent Gillespie, Dean Jorgensen, Aisha Khatib, Roman Kotovych, Sarah Lai, Jossann MacKenzie, Breanne McCook, Cassandra McDonough, Julia-Lin Miller, Neil Parmer, Mike Reid, Christine Rogerson, Melanie Sohn, Lorelei White, Bradley Wuetherick**

Ross: Will we be getting rid of this terrible, pompous award anytime soon? Brechtel: This award is run independently by the Gold Key Society.

Carried (Abstaining: Alampi)

2002-21/13d (Special Order #6)

HUDEMA/BRECHTEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Awards Selection Committee, ratify the selection of the winners of the S.A.I.U.T.E. Awards

ratify the selection of the winners of the S.A.L.U.T.E. Awards.

**Dr. David Cook** (Pharmacology), **Dr. Okine** (Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics), **Dr. Walji** (Anatomy)

**Carried**

2002-21/13e
Standing Orders
(Special Order #7)

JONES/KELLY RESOLVED THAT Students' Council amend Standing Order 32 – Annual Remembrance by inserting the words "Mister Rogers" after Friendly Giant and before Ernie Coombs.

*Please see document LA 02-21.02.*

**Carried**

2002-21/13g
Conference
(Special Order #8)

SMITH/HUDEMA MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the budget for the Ottawa Lobby Trip/Accessibility Conference.

*Please see document LA 02-21.03.*

**Smith: Sharma** will already be in the area on someone else's expense so this is a well-justified expense.

**Sharma**: This is the CFS and Canadian Association of University Teachers conference. I will be in the area on personal business. This will allow me to meet with MPs, especially Alliance MPs (the Alliance party will soon be putting forth a policy on PSE as they do not currently have one).

ROSS MOVED TO REPLACE "$120" with "$70".

**Ross: Sharma's** transportation from the NDP conference to CFS is a $50 expenditure that should not be borne by students.

**Hudema: Sharma** will be going from the NDP conference to this one. There is a high value for this conference. This is $50 well spent and already budgeted. This is particularly cheap for Anand who likes to live it up.

**Smith:** We always pay for people's transportation costs to a conference. Transporting **Sharma** from Montreal to Ottawa is significantly cheaper than from Edmonton.

Withdrawn

**Kawanami:** Didn't **Sharma** exhaust his travel budget at the Le Feuq conference?

**Smith:** This will require only a small transfer between the national lobbying and external budgets, sufficiently close to the original purpose of the money.

**Carried** (Abstaining: **Sharma**)

2002-21/13h (Special Order #9)
"CRC Nom Com"

SHARMA MOVED THAT Students' Council appoint one councilor to sit on the Community Relations Coordinator Nomination Committee.
Congratulations to **Beamish**

2002-21/13i (Special Order #10)
"VPEx Boards Nom Com"

SHARMA MOVED THAT Students' Council appoint one councilor to sit on the VP External Boards and Committees Nomination Committee.
Congratulations to **Gill**
Gill/Samuel moved to adjourn

2002-21/17

ADJOURNMENT (9:55)
GILL/SAMUEL MOVED TO ADJOURN
**Carried**

*University of Alberta Students' Union*

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

## Tuesday March 18, 2003 – 6:00 PM
## Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

**MINUTES (SC 2002-22)**

| Faculty/Position | Name | 6:00 | 9:00 | Roll Call Vote #1 Exec Salaries |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| President | Mike Hudema | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| VP Academic | Mat Brechtel | ✓ | ✓ | Abstain |
| VP External | Anand Sharma | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| VP Finance | Steve Smith | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| VP Student Life | Kail Ross | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| BoG Rep. | Mike Reid | ✓ | × | |
| Residence Halls Association | George Slomp | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| U of A Athletics Board | | | | |
| Agric/Forest/HomeEc | Teodora Alampi | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Agric/Forest/HomeEc | Paul Reikie | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Arts | Chris Bolivar | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Arts | Kyle Kawanami | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Arts | James Knull | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Arts | Matt Oberhoffner | ✓ | ✓ | For |
| Arts | Alexis Pepin | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Arts | Laura Roberts | ✓ | ✓ | Against |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arts | Vivek Sharma | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Arts | Paul Welke | ✓ | ✓ | Abstain |
| Business | Jamie Kidston | × | × | |
| Business | Meena Rajulu | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Business | Holly Tomte | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Education | Charles Beamish | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Education | Daljeet Chhina | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Education | Allison Ekdahl | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Education | Mandeep Gill | ✓ | × | |
| Education | Janet Lo | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Engineering | Chris Jones | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Engineering | Margaret Laffin | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Engineering | Paige Smith | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Engineering | Michelle Vigeant | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Engineering | David Weppler | ✓ (6:40) | ✓ | Against |
| Law | Paul Varga | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Medicine/Dentistry | Miranda Richardson | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Medicine/Dentistry | Jeffrey Cao | × | × | |
| Native Studies | Valerie Knaga | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Nursing | | | | |
| Open Studies | | | | |
| Open Studies | | | | |
| Pharmacy | Kurt Greene | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Physical Education | Holly Higgins | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Rehabilitation Medicine | Sarah Booth | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Faculté Saint-Jean | Lisa Clyburn | ✓ | ✓ | For |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science | Chamila Adhihetty (James Meeker) | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Science | Kimberly Dary | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Science | Katie Grant | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Science | Aisha Khatib | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Science | Tereza Elyas | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Science | Chris Samuel | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Science | Steven Schendel (Duncan Taylor) | ✓ | ✓ | Against |
| Science | Kimmy Williams | ✓ (6:20) | ✓ | For |
| General Manager | Bill Smith | × | × | |
| Speaker | Gregory Harlow | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Recording Secretary | Helen McGraw | ✓ | ✓ | |
| | | | | Defeated (3/37/2) |

**Observers: Alex Taylor, Carissa Reiniger, Alex "Haji-something-or-other", Sara Katz, Roman Kotovych, Mustafa Hirji, Matt Robertson, James Crossman, Chelli Kelly, Chris Weaver, Josh Bazin, Nick Tam, Sarah Kelly, Shawna Pandya, and "The fans who make this happen."**

## Minutes (SC 2002-22)

2002-22/1 CALL TO ORDER (6:05)

2002-22/4 SPEAKER'S BUSINESS

**Brechtel** and **Smith** have provided the required evidence of their student status; **Hudema** and **Sharma** are still in arrears.

2002-22/8 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

BEAMISH/EKDAHL MOVED TO APPROVE the minutes from the March 11 meeting.
JONES/SMITH MOVED TO POSTPONE until the next meeting

Carried

2002-22/9 QUESTION PERIOD

**Reid**: What is the impetus behind the motion to remove several associate director positions?

**Smith**: 3 positions are up for the axe: 1) The ECOS director currently works a lot more than the mandated 20hrs/wk; the AD's salary will be 2) ADs keep leaving SDC because they think the job will be mostly counseling when it's in fact mostly admin. 3) By next fall we expect there to be an online registration system for student groups, thus mitigating the need for an AD. Temporary staff would be hired for clubs fair, etc.

**Samuel**: Why is the exec still planning to kill VIDS, even though Christine McCourt and Bill Smith support its continued existence?

**Hudema**: Making VIDS useful to students would require an unreasonable financial investment.

**Kawanami**: Why wasn't the incoming exec consulted on this?

**Smith**: Exec meetings are open and incoming exec were welcome to attend (only **Samuel** did)

**Bolivar**: Two union representatives spoke at the recent high school leadership conference. There is speculation that we owed them this opportunity after their support during the tuition rallies. Are there any other groups to whom we owe favors?

**Sharma**: We don't owe anyone any favors. We decided to include a presentation on leadership in the workplace because many students are unaware of their rights. The United Food and Commercial Workers were chosen because they have supported the SU in the past. This will probably not be continued next year as the response from students was mediocre. The sports leadership section also had a poor response. Kail did well for some inexplicable reason.

**Clyburn**: Can we expect a report evaluating both the whole and individual elements of the high school leadership conference?

**Sharma**: One will be prepared and presented both to EAB and to Council.

**Smith (Councilor):** Would **Weppler** be so kind as to share with Council the limerick her presented at the Engineering elections forum?

**Weppler:**

So I was drinkin' some beer down at Moe's
And was feeling good right to my toes
Then in walked Anand
On his arm was a blonde
And I laughed the beer out of my nose

**Jones:** The former wall of debt has had many things posted on it and it is already showing signs of wear, due to tape. Is there a policy in place governing what will go up on the wall to preserve it and avoid untimely repair costs?

**Smith:** Non-bulletin board postings need to be approved by the exec. I personally have observed neither wear nor tear.

**Lo:** Please elaborate on the rental agreement with the Womens' Center?

**Hudema:** This is a rental agreement between the SU and the Womens' Center Collective, similar to the rental agreements with the Gateway and CJSR.

**Reid:** Why did **Ross** not support this agreement?

**Ross:** I have a problem with a group whose sole purpose is to eliminate sexism by excluding 50% of the campus community. No men are allowed to have say or participation; the constitution will be drafted without their input. I can't support such a double standard.

**Reid:** Is it true that the Womens' Center operates to the exclusion of men?

**Hudema:** Their original proposal was for 2 rooms, one women-only (a safe room), the other a common room. Women-only room was removed at exec committee; only the common, inclusive room was approved. This is an autonomous organization and it's not up to us to control what they become.

**Williams:** Does the Womens' Center allow men to have input into the constitution?

**Hudmea:** Yes. There are two consulting groups: one all women, the other open.

**Hudema:** Is **Knaga** aware that the SU most humbly apologizes that Native Studies was left off the ballot and we will ensure that it's included next year?

**Knaga:** Yes I am, thanks.

**Kawanami:** EAB will be holding a meeting Friday at 4:00. Will **Sharma** be coming or does the rest of the committee need to go it alone?
**Sharma:** I'll be meeting with high school students then but I'll try to work it in.

**Jones:** AAB is the only SU board or committee whose minutes are up to date on the website; why is **Hudema** unable to ensure that councilors and other members of the SU can access this information in the timely manner guaranteed by the constitution?
**Hudema:** It is hard to control anyone on this exec. I hope they will all post their minutes promptly.

**Samuel:** How did the campus advantage meeting go?
**Smith:** Being a shareholder is valuable but I don't think that being on the board of directors is necessarily a good idea.

**Welke:** How much is a public intoxication charge going for these days?
**Kawanami:** In Halifax they're running at $111.50, but only if you're in a tree.

**Sharma (Councilor): Samuel**, before you ask your next question, does everyone need to hear it?
**Samuel:** Yes

**Samuel:** Is it true that **Sharma** was disqualified from the ASA elections despite notifying **Oberhoffner** that he would be late for the candidates' meeting?
**Oberhoffner:** I was not the FADRO for this election; I assure you that everything is on the up and up.

2002-22/10 APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (MINUTES)

JONES/LAFFIN MOVED TO STRIKE 3a [VIDS]
**Jones:** Council doesn't have enough information to decide whether VIDS should be eliminated.
**Hudema:** The relevant boards have been consulted
**Samuel:** Bill Smith and Juliana Dupree think that VIDS is a useful system and should not be scrapped; it is not prudent to ignore their opinions.
**Ross:** VIDS will require at least $15,000 to become useful.

**Smith:** This was an excellent decision on the part of the executive committee. I'd be happy to provide council with more information so that we can approve this at the next meeting.

WEPPLER MOVED the previous question
**Carried**

**Carried**

2002-22/12 LEGISLATION

2002-22/12a
**Bylaw 2200: Councilor Elections**

SMITH/SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the proposed changes to Bylaw 2200 (SECOND Reading).
*Please bring supporting documentation from the February 4, 2003 meeting.*

**Smith:** This stems from the FARCE recommendations to centralize dates and control of councilor elections. Council has approved this in principle.

OBERHOFFNER/KNULL MOVED TO:
1) Insert item 2n reading: "'FADRO' shall mean Faculty Association Deputy Returning Officer, and shall be a student in the faculty or school appointed by the relevant faculty or school association and approved by the CRO, to perform the duties of the CRO for faculty or school association executive, students' council and General Faculties Council Elections."
2) Amend sec 118 to read: "Nominations and elections for representative(s) of a faculty or school shall be conducted by the faculty or school association through a FADRO, within the constraints of this bylaw."

**Smith:** This motion is contrary to the principles approved in first reading. Faculty elections are a joke. Few faculties have demonstrated an ability to run legitimate elections; the CRO can delegate authority to those faculties as appropriate.
**Sharma:** These elections should not be run by FAs because their executives are involved in the process. In the Arts Students' Association, there is an idea that certain people should be acclaimed and that other candidates should be prevented from running. If FAs want to run their exec elections that way, that's their decision, but Students' Council elections need to be held to a higher standard.

**Kelly (Sarah):** If you do have those concerns, it might be worthwhile to create a new position. The CRO is underpaid and this would give her too much to do.
**Clyburn:** FARCE did consultations for a good two months during the summertime and not one FA came to talk to us. Now people who couldn't be bothered to show up during the summer are trying to usurp the process. Centralized elections will solve apathy problems and ensures every potential councilor on campus has the same opportunity.
**Taylor:** It is important that the CRO be able to delegate authority to a FADRO or there will simply be an unreasonable amount of work to do.
**Jones:** We currently have forced delegation to FAs and it is a shambles. Some have appointments; other elections are not up to the standards of 3rd world banana republics; others hold elections that Jimmy Carter would be proud of. Councilors are not representatives of their FAs but rather the students of their faculties. Elections need to be governed under common dates, nomination packages and criteria. The CRO could delegate if confident in the abilities of a FA but should not be obligated to. This is contrary to the very intent of this bylaw; if you want to do this, defeat the bylaw in its entirety and start over.
**Weppler:** Council is the most powerful body in the SU and it is essential that councilors be chosen in legitimate elections. Please defeat this amendment
**Oberhoffner:** Nowhere does this amendment require that Councilors represent the interests of FAs. This is the first year in the last three that all positions in the ASA executive are being contested; we have 16 people running for council and that's more than democratic. There has been a lot of talk in COFA about strengthening the role of FAs and their role in the university; centralizing councilor elections is contrary to this principle.

BOLIVAR/HUDEMA MOVED the previous question
**Carried**

**Defeated (10/32/2)**

OBERHOFFNER/KNULL MOVED TO ADD new sec 70: "Although a Faculty or School Association may choose to incorporate one of that faculty's representative(s) to Students' Council with other positions within the faculty or school association, and the students' union will fund only campaign costs that

deal exclusively with the election of a faculty or school association representative to Students' Council, ballots of such a combined position may, however, include all positions contested by candidates(s) within and/or external to the faculty or school association."

Oberhoffner: This would allow FAs to designate one of their faculty's council seats to a member of the FA exec.
Samuel (POI): Would this include FAs with only one council seat?
Oberhoffner: Yes. FAC currently has only one seat and it is traditionally held by their VP external whose only job is to liaise with Council.
Smith: This is the single most onerous amendment proposed in Council this year. It is unacceptable for FAsto put their own toadies onto council.
Ekdahl: FA exec members are better placed to discuss the goings on of their faculties.
Welke: The president of an association is elected to represent the students of their faculty; what better way to do this than through council?
Kawanami: Unlike many of the indignities committed to the FARCE recommendations, this one is a hill I'm willing to die on. This would continue an electoral apartheid whereby different councilors are elected according to different rules. Any halfway decent Councilor will know what's going on with their faculty; they don't have to be on a FA exec.
Lo: Faculty executives are free to contest council positions. Students should be able to elect the most qualified individual for the position.
Williams: Science had 21 people run in elections last year but UASUS regularly has acclaimed presidents who are obligated to sit on council, regardless of whether they really want to be there.
Jones: Council is meant to be directly representative of students, not of FAs. If representation from Fas is essential, COFA should be made into a senate. This amendment must die.
Knull: A FA is more than just a club; it represents the students of that faculty and it is important that that body has a voice on Council. The interests of a FA should never diverge from those of councilors; a president who doesn't represent the views of students on council is probably not a very good president.
Sharma(POI): Aren't arts Councilors bound by policies

passed by the ASA exec?
**Knull**: Only the ASA president is bound by these policies.
**Kawanami (POI)**: Haven't past FA Presidents on council abused their positions to obtain funds for the benefits of their FAs?
**Knull**: That was for the benefit of students in their faculties.

REIKIE/WELKE MOVED the previous question
**Carried**

**Defeated (10/29/1)**

**Oberhoffner**: I encourage you to defeat this bylaw since my voice apparently doesn't have much influence at Council.
**Lo**: What exactly will start "15 days after executive elections"?
**Taylor**: I encourage someone to define FADRO and to give the CRO power to delegate to that individual, rather than to a FA; allowing delegation to FAs allows an unreasonable conflict of interest.
**Smith**: The election itself will not occur less than 15 days after the exec elections. I trust that the CRO would only delegate authority to a FA with appropriate infrastructure in place.

OBERHOFFNER/WELKE MOVED TO ADD new section 2n reading: "'FADRO' shall mean Faculty Association Deputy Returning Officer and shall be a student in that faculty or school, appointed by the relevant faculty or school association and approved by the CRO"

**Smith**: I trust that this will be defeated as were the other amendments in **Oberhoffner's** one-man battle against the FARCE recommendations. This defines a term that is never used again in the bylaw and is thus pointless.
**Weppler**: This sets a dangerous precedent for micromanagement by the CRO.

JONES MOVED TO STRIKE the word "association" from the term FADRO
**Friendly**

**Defeated (17/19/5)**

**Carried (28/9/2) Opposed: Welke, Oberhoffner**

2002-22/12b
Bylaw 7550: Student Development Center

ROSS/SMITH MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Student Life Board, adopt the proposed changes to Bylaw 7550 relating to the Student Development Centre (SECOND Reading).

**Ross:** This bylaw governs our newest student service; it is intentionally vague and necessarily so.
**Carried (25/0/0)**

2002-22/12c
Bylaw 7200: Orientation

ROSS/BRECHTEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the proposed changes to Bylaw 7200 (SECOND Reading).

**Ross:** Many superfluous articles that didn't need to be included were a part of the old bylaw. It has since been made more concise. All the relevant staff support this.
**Carried (27/1/3)**

2002-22/12d
Communications Advisory Committee

SMITH/SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, repeal Bylaw 5200 (FIRST Reading).

**Smith:** Former executives in their infinite wisdom decided that the best way to cut through red tape and connect with students was to create a committee. This committee deals with issues of executive, rather than legislative character and the bylaw itself is archaic and should therefore be repealed.
**Hudema:** Communicating with students is a worthy cause for the existence of a committee.
**Smith:** We have too many bylaws, most of which are ignored by everyone except the members of Hack Club 7. Removing bylaws is an inherently valuable exercise.
**Sharma:** Other committees, particularly EAB, have had to compensate for the non-existence of CAC this year. While it's popular and indeed fun to get rid of as much as you can, it is important to consider why these committees were created in the first place.
**Weppler:** The committee found what didn't work to communicate with students: CAC. Let's get rid of this.
**Kawanami:** If you vote this down, I expect to see constructive legislation at the next council meeting explaining who will be chairing CAC.
**Hirji:** As the SAL on this committee for its entire existence

and having attended each of its meetings, I can attest to its uselessness. This job is the purview of an executive committee, not a legislative one.
**Varga**: Does the board meet regularly, or only when there is an issue to be discussed?
**Smith**: It had regular meetings.

Carried (27/8/5)

2002-22/12e OBERHOFFNER/ALAMPI MOVED THAT Students' Council approve the proposed changes to Bylaw 3200.
*Please see document SC 02-22.01.*

OBERHOFFNER/WEPPLER MOVED TO DIVIDE the question into 9c and 10 (Executive Salaries) and 9v (Councilor Honoraria)
Carried

9c and 10: Executive Salaries
**Oberhoffner**: Many students are embarrassed that our execs make less than an average restaurant cook makes. We pay our execs $19,600/year. Compare to other schools: U of L: $20,000; RDC: >$20,000; MRC: $30,000; U of M: $30,000; U of C: $24,000; GMCC: $24,000. This change would bring salaries more in line with those in the rest of the province.
**Hudema**: I'm not ashamed that we are low-paid; I think it's something to be proud of. This is plenty for someone to live on. A salary review is scheduled for next year; there is no reason to arbitrarily do this when there is a process in place. Our financial position will be much better farther in the future than it will be next year. While I appreciate the gesture, I would hate to see programming cut to cover this.
**Sharma**: This should be considered by the Salary Review committee. Exec shouldn't be lucrative; people shouldn't get into this job for the money. If we're out there fighting for increased living allowances for students, we need to provide all of our staff, not just execs more. We should emphasize quality, rather than our current mentality of paying cheap and tolerating high turnover. Salaries should be increased but not now or this way. Salaries should not be a barrier for people to run.
**Welke**: Low pay does decrease accessibility. I didn't run because I can't afford the pay cut: right now I make a little more than the execs and I get to play with guns and fly around in helicopters.

WELKE/BEAMISH MOVED TO strike an ad hoc exec salary review committee and to review this question to them.
**Weppler:** Our salary review committee exists for a reason. Lets defeat this and continue with our business.
**Kawanami:** Bad things happen when we try to make things up on the fly. No compelling reasons have been presented for the creation of this committee.
**Samuel:** This shouldn't be done on the fly, as much as I'd like to "bling bling"
**Oberhoffner:** This salary review committee hasn't met in the four years I've been at this school and no one seems to know what is comprised of.
**Smith:** Last year, council passed a bylaw establishing a 4 year cycle. A salary review committee will be struck every 4 years. This is not meant to be a committee that meets regularly.
**Weppler:** It is dangerous to deal with salaries in this haphazard manner as emotions are often attached to them. The salary review committee exists for a reason.
**Taylor:** It is unfair to consider exec salaries in isolation without considering the remuneration to other SU employees.
Defeated

**Laffin:** This is very similar to when we considered the remuneration of the speaker and recording secretary. Did people whine when we did that?
**Smith:** It is inappropriate to be doing this piecemeal when a process for review already exists.
**Oberhoffner:** Barriers are important to consider. If I'm going to take a year off school, I need to be able to afford to live.
**Kawanami:** Given our current exec's actions toward salaries given to university administration, it is particularly important to follow due process before increasing their salaries.
**Pepin:** It is important to pay our exec fairly but also to pay all SU employees fairly. The salaries are known in advance. People don't take these jobs for the money. These jobs are rewarding in terms of flexibility, contacts and personal growth. Other schools' execs have different internal structures and different VPS have different roles and responsibilities.
**Taylor:** It is unfair to consider exec salaries in isolation.

REIKIE/VARGA MOVED the previous question

Carried

Defeated (Roll Call) (3/37/2)

9v Councilor Honoraria

**Oberhoffner**: The $500 figure is in line with other councils around the province. Please support this in principle. While the amount itself is amendable, it is important that council be recognized for its hard work.
**Varga**: There's enough resume padding going on here; we don't need to pad our wallets as well.
**Williams**: Councilors should be here to represent students, not for the money.
**Reikie**: This has the potential to pervert councilors' intentions for running.
**Bolivar**: For the amount of effort we put in, $500 is a slap in the face. $500 won't make a difference in terms of greater accessibility. I don't think that giving councilors a monetary honorarium is appropriate. Other concessions (coffee, food, etc.) would be a better sign of appreciation.
**Weppler**: The optics of this are terrible. Students do this for much better reasons than money and there are some things that money can't buy.
**Sharma (Councilor):** This will make it easier for the average student to be here.
**Sharma**: We have a responsibility to appreciate councilors; there are low cost ways to do this. You call it fiscally prudent; I call it inconsiderate of other peoples' needs.
**Brechtel**: Right now we are debating in principle the idea of rewarding councilors. A committee can consider the particulars of how to reward councilors. It is essential that this be in bylaw to ensure transparency and protect it from negligent execs.
**Taylor**: This will encourage people to come to council, receive their honorarium and not contribute.
**Welke**: Someone who runs for council for a $500 honorarium would likely lose an election since they're unlikely to go to the effort to run a real election campaign.

BEAMISH/SLOMP MOVED the previous question
Defeated

**Pepin**: Consider the precedent that this would set. There are many other individuals who make important contributions to the SU; are we to give honoraria to all of them?

**Kelly (Chelli):** This isn't enough for people to show up only for the money.
**Jones:** The optics are the worst part of this. If this is a real concern, it should be put to referendum. Who better to decide than those we're representing?
**Samuel:** This will cost about $22,000/year; this money will have to come out of some other program. If councilors are to be rewarded in a non-monetary way, it doesn't belong in bylaw 3200. Codifying this in bylaw needlessly ties the hands of executives.
**Smith:** There is something wrong with the exec deciding whether Councilors should be awarded. Any compensation needs to be non-arbitrary and publicly available. I support this motion but it needs a lot of work. You get what you pay for and this would buy us some legitimacy. I'm running for council but I expect to lose my seat, I don't think this will pass, and I'd plan to donate my honorarium to the food bank anyway.
**Kawanami:** The existence of 2nd reading is no excuse for passing shoddy legislation. We're treating "$500" as if it means "we're going to give councilors stuff"

ROSS/SLOMP MOVED the previous question
**Defeated**

**Knull:** Councilors are the only non-SALs that are not remunerated. Once Councilors are included in bylaw 3200, they'd be subject to the quadrennial salary review process; the slippery slope argument is fallacious. People don't vote for people they think are corrupt. Students will care more about what we do if we're getting paid. This change would remove barriers to participation.
**Higgins:** You can't pay for quality or accountability.
**Hudema:** Where will this $22,000 come from? The money simply isn't there.

SMITH(COUNCILOR)/SLOMP MOVED the previous question
**Carried**

**Defeated (13/21/1) Opposed: Weppler, Kawanami, Jones, Pepin, Lo, Williams**

2002-22/13 NEW BUSINESS

2002-22/13a WEPPLER/JONES MOVED THAT the Engineering Non-Academic Fee Proposal approved by Students' Council be amended to bring it into alignment with the University's fee collection capabilities by:

(1) Striking "Visiting and Special students are exempted from payment under the Bylaw." from the proposal.

(2) Striking "During Intersession, only those Engineering students who are taking on-campus classes where Intersession is a regularly-scheduled part of their degree program are subject to the fee." from the proposal.

(3) Striking "Students who are enrolled in CIV E 251 ("Survey School") during Intersession do not pay the fee if they would not otherwise do so." from the proposal and striking the accompanying explanatory test relating to CIV E 251.

(4) Replacing the text "opt-out mechanism" with "refund mechanism".

(5) Replacing the text "Engineering Students' Social Activities Fund" and the text "ESSAF" with the text "Engineering Student Activities Fund" and "ESAF", respectively.

**Weppler**: These changes are necessary to bring the fee in line with the abysmal capabilities of PeopleSoft. The principles of the original proposal are kept intact.

**Sharma**: Are you comfortable with the number of students opposed to this?

**Weppler**: Yes. We had numerous requirements, including a minimum voter turnout, that were approved by council.

**Carried (23/6/2)**

2002-22/17 ADJOURNMENT (9:50)
SMITH/OBERHOFFNER MOVED to Adjourn
**Carried**

PROPOSED

*THE STUDENTS' UNION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA*

# POLITICAL POLICY STATEMENT

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Policy Number:* | | *Effective Date:* | *Page* **1** *of* **1** | |
| | | *Expiration Date:* | | |
| *Responsibility for Policy:* | | **Students' Council** | | |
| *Subject Matter* | - *Category:* | **POLITICAL POLICY (GENERAL)** | | |
| | - *Specific:* | ***SARS*** | | |
| | - *Topic:* | | | |

WHEREAS the disease known as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) causes death to some of its victims,

AND WHEREAS the death of a student severely compromises his or her accessibility to post-secondary education,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union of the University of Alberta is opposed to SARS.

**Policy History:**

| Reference/Vote | Board/Committee | Date of Council Approval |
|---|---|---|

# *THE STUDENTS' UNION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA*

# OPERATING POLICY STATEMENT

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Policy Number:* | **11.30** | *Effective Date:* | **February 20, 2003** | *Page* | **1** | *of* | **1** |
| *Responsibility for Policy:* | | **Executive Committee** | | | | | |
| *Subject Matter* | - *Category:* | **OPERATING POLICY (GENERAL)** | | | | | |
| | - *Specific:* | ***SPACE*** | | | | | |
| | - *Topic:* | **SUB stage** | | | | | |

**Introduction:**

The Students' Union recognizes that the SUB stage is a high profile area for events that inform and entertain users of the space. Additionally, we also understand that the surrounding relaxation area and office spaces are required to meet a variety of student needs. Therefore, it has become imperative to establish booking and fee protocol. The Students' Union shall extend priority booking to student groups, services within SUB, SUB tenants, and University, respectively.

**Policy:**

11.30.1 The Operations Manager - Venues is responsible for booking the SUB stage.

11.30.2 The SUB stage may be booked between the following hours: Monday - Friday: Noon - 1:30pm and after 4:30pm. Saturdays and Sundays may be booked at the discretion of the Operations Manager - Venues.

11.30.3 The SUB stage may not be booked during the exam periods or when SUB is open for 24 hour study.

11.30.4 Groups may book only once per week, two events per month. Bookings must be made no less than 10 working days in advance.

11.30.5 Any events outside the parameters established in 11.30.2 and/or 11.30.4 must be approved by the Executive Committee.

11.30.6 The following is the fee outline:

## Rates

| Type of Event | | SU Groups | University | Off Campus |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Base rate (incl. 1 mic) | per hr | Free | $50 | $100 |
| Requiring technician | min. 2 hrs | $18/hr | $18/hr | $18/hr |
| Use of Data Projector | per hr | Free | $25 | $50 |
| Movie Showing | 2 hrs | Free | $189 | $336 |

11.30.7 SUB stage users shall not violate any agreements or contracts the Students' Union has with other parties, or SU policies regarding acceptable content.

**Policy History:**

| | Date | Board/Committee | Date of Council Approval |
|---|---|---|---|
| Created | Mar 12, 2003 | Executive Committee | |